

Exhibit C

From: [Campbell, Jay R.](#)
To: [Christine Kim](#); [Alex Straus](#)
Cc: [Bernstein, David A.](#); [Mizgala, James W.](#)
Subject: Re: NGX Reply Brief
Date: Monday, August 24, 2020 1:27:51 PM

Christine and Alex:

Should I take it from your failure to respond to my email of Saturday that NeuroGrafix violated the protective order and the agreement between counsel and provided Mr. Clark's deposition or quotes from it to Dr. Filler?

Best,
Jay

Jay R. Campbell| Attorney | Tucker Ellis LLP
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100 | Cleveland, OH 44113
Direct: 216-696-5639 | Mobile: 330-421-8897 |
jay.campbell@tuckerellis.com
tuckerellis.com

Cleveland | Los Angeles | San Francisco | Chicago | Houston | Columbus | St. Louis

From: Campbell, Jay R.
Sent: Saturday, August 22, 2020 2:15 PM
To: Christine Kim <ckim@tensorlaw.com>; Alex Straus <astraus@tensorlaw.com>
Cc: Bernstein, David A. <David.Bernstein@tuckerellis.com>; Mizgala, James W. <James.Mizgala@tuckerellis.com>
Subject: NGX Reply Brief

Christine and Alex:

NGX's initial Reply Brief and its re-write of today include copious cites to Sean Clark's deposition. The initial version in fact includes actual text from Mr. Clark's deposition. Given the hyperbole throughout the brief and the standard accusations of misrepresentation, there is no doubt that Dr. Filler wrote the majority if not all of the brief. Mr. Clark's deposition is designated attorney-eyes only and we made clear both before the deposition and during that Dr. Filler was not permitted to read Mr .Clark's deposition. Can you explain how NeuroGrafix met its obligation under the protective order given the citations and quotations from Mr. Clark's deposition?

Best,
Jay

Jay R. Campbell| Attorney | Tucker Ellis LLP
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100 | Cleveland, OH 44113

Direct: 216-696-5639 | Mobile: 330-421-8897 |
jay.campbell@tuckerellis.com
tuckerellis.com

Cleveland | Los Angeles | San Francisco | Chicago | Houston | Columbus | St. Louis